From:	Contact Centre (CRM) < contact@rib	oblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent:	01 April 2024 11:28	
To: Subject:	Planning Planning Application Comments - 3,	/2024/0196 FS-C252-601454082
Subject.	rialifing Application Comments - 3/	/2024/013013-Case-001434002
Planning Application F	Reference No.: 3/2024/0196	
Address of Developme	ent: Hawthorne Farm Development of	ff Hawthorne Place Clitheroe
Address of Developing	Trawthorner arm bevelopment of	in riawthorner tace outheree
Comments: I refer to the	e amended application in regards to	levels, boundary treatment and drainage
plan recently submitted	l as a supposed improvement on the	previous denied plan. Specifically I refer
to the external works fo	rm and Sections sheet 2 both of whic	h significantly feature and
The "existing levels" ind	icated in these cross sections are inc	
hatwaan 40 F0am fram		ected from flooding by being raised up by
	_	d are held back by a concrete block wall. ter seen in photos previously submitted
Tills has always been so	Inclent to avoid the regular mood was	ter seem in priotos previousty submitted
The cross section	indicates that	and proposes a
retaining wall at		– a raise of over a meter
from current levels and	not the 60cm suggested in the plans.	. This would
		which will
•	•	stalled culvert and drainage surrounding
		ood water in the remaining original field
level area and this woul		is allowed. Further to this the 1:3 slope
	pear possible in practice	ow points on the site. Diagrams showing
where flood water pools		nd the response would appear to be to
·	to move the new low point	which will not be drained.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	ing wall with a 2.5m fence topped with a
further 50cm trellis. Thi		liculously imposing 3.5M high barrier
which would completel		area oppressive and unusable. It would
also prevent us from		. This is compounded by the fact that the
2 storey plus gable end		and will then continue to be built
from a new artificial gro		
	submitted suggest that the	to the new build is
. This is again ta	lse as it does not allow for the	
l would implore anyone	involved in the decision making regar	rding this proposal to please
		have offered this opportunity to planners

and Persimmon in order to see for themselves just how unreasonable, impactive and oppressive these proposals are.				
2				

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 01 April 2024 20:52

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0196 FS-Case-601602480

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0196

Address of Development: HAWTHORNE FARM, CLITHEROE

Comments: There's a risk of flooding of to over 10% of the properties and this risk is too high. Attachement 240196 Flood Routing Plan indicates the area of exceedance extends to such a distance as to potentially affect 10% of the total number of properties in this phase of development. The flood waters will not only extend on to the garden areas but go on to potentially enter the houses. There doesn't appear to be enough proposed engineered solutions to avoid flooding internally to the properties.

From:

Sent: 08 April 2024 12:48

To:

Planning

Cc:

Subject:

Planning Application 3/2024/0196 Approval of details reserved by Conditions 9 (surface water sustainable drainage scheme) and 17 (boundary treatment) of planning permission 3/2019/1104.

Λ

External Email

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

For the attention of the planning department:-

We write to object to the above application submitted by Persimmon Homes following the refusal of application 3/2022/1116 to discharge the drainage conditions. The section 106 on the original application for this site 3/2019/1104 states under the conditions laid out, signed and agreed by RVBC Chief Executive, Lancashire County Council and Persimmon Homes, the following condition was agreed to in relation to drainage on the site...

FINAL SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SCHEME TO BE SUBMITTED

No development shall commence until a final, detailed surface water sustainable drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

This scheme was refused by RVBC in December 2023, worded as follows...

The proposed drainage scheme is not accepted as it is dependent upon raising land levels on the site which do not form part of the consented development will result in an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties on Park Avenue. Furthermore, the Lead Local Flood Authority have expressed concern with the raising of land levels and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed scheme including the raised levels will not result in an increased risk of flooding for surrounding properties off-site.

Land levels have clearly been raised significantly, where once it was level from Hawthorne Place into the field, the road at the entrance to the site is now a steep gradient (see attached photos of Google maps prior to development, the steep entrance road post development and the new road level being constructed towards Park Avenue).

Despite having not satisfied the conditions to have secured planning permission Persimmon continued with this development. When questioned the planning department advised residents that it is at Persimmons own risk to continue with development prior to the discharge of this condition. Persimmon not only took the risk of developing, but actually sold properties which are now occupied and all prior to securing full and proper planning permission to do so. We suppose for them this risk paid off, to the detriment of existing residents around the site. This has left a number of residents on

the Hawthorne Place border with no redress to the overbearing properties built too high, affording no privacy and resulting in flooding.

This all began in February 2023 when we first emailed our concerns of overlooking and height to the planning officer. Having an existing property between us and the new properties we did not envisage that we would be so overlooked and not just by first floor windows of the new properties but ground floor and gardens. The planning officer dismissed our concerns saying all was as approved. This continued for some months during which we demonstrated that Persimmon had also levelled and raised their site at Cheadle by over 2 metres, thereby avoiding the costly removal of topsoil off site. Persimmon had applied for retrospective planning permission and were in mitigation with residents as new properties were occupied. Despite this our very real concerns were in fact not considered by RVBC until residents completed planning enforcement complaints forms. During this time the properties continued to completion, were sold and occupied by the time the drainage application was refused in December 2023.

Then on March 26th 2024 Persimmon invited residents to an 'informal drop in session'. During what became a somewhat heated meeting the Persimmons technical manager, admitted that there was no planning permission for heights on not only the Park Avenue border, but the whole site. Previously we had been told and dismissed by the planning officer saying all was as approved when in fact this was not the case and even the drainage application was still pending at this stage before being later refused. This is completely unfair, we are left with this problem now only to be told that in the same planning officers 'professional opinion', the Hawthorne border is acceptable. No measurements or independant survey just the same officer who stated all was as approved when it was not, saying this is acceptable, well we can assure you it is not. We have invited planning to attend our neighbouring properties to see for themselves the negative impact the heights and proximity have on existing properties affording both existing and new residents no privacy whatsoever. The solution pointed out by RVBC is a hedge which will take years to establish to a point where it will create a screen. If the properties were built lower this would not be a problem.

As predicted and as raised with RVBC this same problem now presents itself at the Park Avenue border where properties are not yet occupied. Again in the planning officers 'professional opinion' due to the raised up levels, the new properties will have a negative impact on existing residents. Persimmon mitigated with high fences, 3 metres high in places. This would not deal with the overbearing nature of these buildings, but in fact add to it. This is nothing but a 'sticking plaster' solution to a problem that should not have been allowed to occur in the first place and those paying the price are the residents. RVBC agrees the properties are too high, but Persimmon stated during the meeting that under no circumstances would levels be lowered. How can this be acceptable when there was no planning permission in place? Residents should be able to expect protection by RVBC planners against development that has such a terrible impact on their amenity. They should be supported and not expected to accept fencing and planting, in lieu of a blatant and deliberate breach of planning. RVBC should act in the best interests of residents and not developers. Persimmon must be forced to take the levels back down and readdress the drainage problems to the satisfaction of the LLFA before developing over the land again as they should have in the first place.

A table shown in the covering letter of Persimmons new application shows little difference between finished floor levels (FFL's) of new and existing properties. This is what is shown on paper, but what is actually in construction on site is too high, too close, overbearing, will afford no privacy at all and block out light. There has still not been any independent measurements or surveys done on this site. We do not feel the mere opinion of the planning officer to be robust enough to stand up against Persimmon appealing and we should not be expected to accept the figures provided by Persimmon to be correct. This company ramped up their building rates to never before seen levels

after the drainage application had been refused in the hope they would not be made to undo works completed. Not even the council's own building inspectors have taken measurements, why not? If RVBC does not stand by residents here then this debacle is a scandal that warrants further investigation. The planning officer is directly responsible for allowing the new properties on the Hawthorne border to become occupied while she wasted time and ignored our complaints telling us all was as approved.

Flooding was cited as a reason for objections to this development in the first place, but was approved regardless. The LLFA officer has rightly and repeatedly raised concerns about the drainage scheme submitted by Persimmon. During the meeting with Persimmon we were told that the LLFA had approved their amended drainage scheme. There is the inclusion of a French drain at the back of Park Avenue to deal with the heightened ground levels and inevitable surface water runoff. As a direct result of the height and surface water run off from this development the garden and greenhouse floods significantly up to the building line of their home where previously it had not flooded. To combat this problem Persimmon, after a great deal of stress and complaints, installed either a French drain or a soakaway. This failed and has been dug up three times, the area continues to flood to date. Persimmon have now planted a hedge over this area yet the residents are still awaiting communication from Persimmon as to what will be done about the flooding. We have also been told that complaints have been made by residents of the new properties as regards drainage in their gardens, but that Persimmon refuses to address the problems. How can this application be approved if it is still flooding? The flooding problems at the back of prove these measures have not worked and also that Persimmon are reluctant to solve the problem. Why then risk putting the residents of Park Avenue in the same situation? May it be that a French drain is not sufficient where there is heavy clay soil and impervious bedrock? This problem is further compounded by Persimmons revelation that a French drain cannot be adopted by United Utilities and will therefore be maintained by a private management company. We only need to check the many media reports for the never ending horror stories of private management companies with high and escalating costs for work not actually carried out. If this drain is not maintained and goes unchecked by any local authority it will quickly cover with clay soil and grass and be of no use.

Also during this meeting Persimmon told residents that the new culvert system on site would reconnect to the existing old culvert off site that runs at the back under gardens of Park Avenue and Hawthorne Place and beyond Waddington Road. Residents asked what would happen if the drainage system on site failed and overwhelmed the old culvert causing flooding off site. The technical manager explained that such flooding would be the responsibility of the land owners ie. the residents. He confirmed that Persimmon had no legal responsibility off site even if the problem was ultimately caused by them and the LLFA would have to be involved in these circumstances. This understandably caused residents a great deal of alarm. The manager claimed Persimmon would have a moral obligation to which the situation at the back of was again highlighted as this remains a problem even while the developers are still onsite not after they have long gone. Residents were not at all reassured, in fact many were distressed by the fact that this could be allowed to happen to them too.

The FRA addendum submitted by consultants Edge details measures that will be installed to manage the flood risk only to end with the line...

These measures will reduce the extent of and risk of pluvial flooding within the site

...what about off site?!

It also states...

That the Surface water outfall pipe is installed at the lowest possible level, and therefore the properties that it serves are also as low as can be in order to ensure they are drained by gravity and not at additional risk of flooding. The only alternative to this would be to permanently pump surface water. This is not considered a sustainable solution.

...why can't this be the solution, given that the technical manager explained that this is the reason for the raised levels? If the water was pumped the levels needn't be raised or is this incorrect? Is it that this solution would have been more costly for the developer? But left as it is, it's at the expense of existing residents' amenity.

Also in this report is a reference to a French drain on the Eastern border and a soak away to the south ie behind the previously mentioned. The residents of Hawthorne Place have been told by the site management that they have properly installed a drain that is wrapped to avoid the pipe becoming filled with silt and topped with chippings. They have been assured that this water will be drained away and into the storm drains. Is it actually the case that the drain installed there is in fact only a ditch filled with chippings to hold water? I would respectfully suggest that someone independant of Persimmon with expert knowledge, such as the LLFA, check this drain before the residents here are left with the problem for good.

At the conclusion of the meeting after much explanation of the drainage plan by the technical manager, residents were left wondering why the attenuation pond had not been installed at the low point of the field? This would appear to be a much better solution negating the need for raised levels.

As you are aware we have suffered no end of problems with daily inconsiderate behavior and disturbance from this site. All of which was wholly unacceptable and far from what could be expected from the day to day running of a construction site. It caused a great deal of stress and complaints were made to the council who, for over eighteen months, failed to act or in cases even believe what we were saying. It was only when this finally culminated in council action by the serving of stop and breach notices that things became more tolerable and as they could have been all along had we only been listened to and considered. In conclusion we would respectfully ask that going forward RVBC please listen and consider the residents here by rejecting this application.

Please could you acknowledge the receipt of this objection as we have experienced problems previously when objections have either not been received or not attached to the correct application.

Many thanks for your time,	



From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>

Sent: 08 April 2024 14:41

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0196 FS-Case-603838586

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0196

Address of Development: Hawthorn Farm

Comments: I wish to strongly object to the drainage application made by Persimmon re Hawthorn

Farm

Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk> From:

10 April 2024 14:03 Sent:

To: Planning

Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0196 FS-Case-604551354 **Subject:**

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0196

Address of Development: Hawthorne Farm

Comments: Further to my previous comment I wish to state that there is no way at all should Persimmon be allowed to put up fence as high as 13.5 m in such close proximity to our properties, It

really does go to s